IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS EASTERN DIVISION

MOTOROLA, INC.,)
Plaintiff,))
V.))
LEMKO CORPORATION, XIAOHONG SHENG, SHAOWEI PAN, HANJUAN JIN, XIAOHUA WU, XUEFENG BAI, NICHOLAS LABUN, BOHDAN PYSKIR, HECHUN CAI, JINZHONG ZHANG, ANGEL FAVILA, ANKUR SAXENA, RAYMOND HOWELL, FAYE VORICK, and NICHOLAS DESAI,	() () () () () () () () () () () () () (
Defendants.	Judge Matthew F. Kennelly
* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *	Magistrate Judge Geraldine Soat Brown))
Counter-Plaintiffs,))
WOTOROLA, INC.,)))
Counter-Defendant.)

PLAINTIFF MOTOROLA, INC.'S MOTION FOR AN EXTENSION OF DEADLINES

Plaintiff Motorola, Inc. (n/k/a Motorola Solutions, Inc., and hereafter referred to as "Motorola"), by and through its attorneys, hereby respectfully requests an extension of deadlines.

An additional modest amount of time—approximately 30 days—is necessary so that Motorola can complete discovery and prepare its case for trial. Much of the discovery remains outstanding due to Defendant Lemko Corporation's ("Lemko") lack of cooperation and due to

events outside of Motorola's control, including Lemko's recent change of counsel which effectively resulted in a one month stay of fact discovery between June and July 2011. Motorola therefore respectfully requests that each of the remaining deadlines be extended by roughly 30 days as follows:

Current Deadlines	Proposed Deadlines
Fact Discovery Deadline	Fact Discovery Deadline
(November 18, 2011)	(December 16, 2011)
26(a)(2) disclosure deadline for the	26(a)(2) disclosure deadline for the
party with burden of proof	party with burden of proof
(January 13, 2012)	(February 10, 2012)
Rebuttal disclosure deadline	Rebuttal disclosure deadline
(February 24, 2012)	(March 23, 2012)
Expert Discovery Deadline	Expert Discovery Deadline
(March 23, 2012)	(April 20, 2012)
Deadline for filing dispositive motions	Deadline for filing dispositive motions
(April 23, 2012)	(May 21, 2012)
Response to disposition motions	Response to disposition motions
(May 21, 2012)	(June 18, 2012)
Replies in support of dispositive motions	Replies in support of dispositive motions
(June 4, 2012)	(July 2, 2012)

Motorola does not seek to change the July 30, 2011 trial date, but understands that date may need to be modified if the Court grants Motorola's current motion.

Wherefore, Motorola respectfully requests that this Honorable Court grant its Motion for an Extension of Deadlines.

Date: July 25, 2011 Respectfully submitted,

By: /s/ Maureen L. Rurka

Dan K. Webb Lawrence R. Desideri Maureen L. Rurka WINSTON & STRAWN LLP 35 West Wacker Drive Chicago, Illinois 60601 T: (312) 558-5600 F: (312) 558-5700 MRurka@winston.com

R. Mark Halligan Deanna R. Swits Jason T. Kunze NIXON PEABODY LLP 300 South Riverside Plaza, 16th Floor Chicago, IL 60606 T: (312) 425-3900 F: (312) 425-3909

Attorneys for Plaintiff Motorola, Inc.

Case: 1:08-cv-05427 Document #: 767 Filed: 07/25/11 Page 4 of 4 PageID #:14109

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

The undersigned certifies that the foregoing was filed electronically in compliance with

the General Order on Electronic Case Filing, Section III(B)(1). As such, these documents were

served on all counsel who are deemed to have consented to electronic service. Fed. R. Civ. P.

5(b)(2)(D) and Local Rule 5.9.

Date: July 25, 2011 /s/ Maureen L. Rurka

Attorney for Plaintiff Motorola, Inc.

4